

## Farm and Garden.

Address all inquiries or communications in relation to agriculture to Dr. T. H. HOSKINS, Newport, Vt.

### Editorial Notings.

A SUBSCRIBER writes: "Can you, or any of your correspondents, inform me, through your paper, where I can get ten-pound boxes to pack butter in? I have seen these packages and am told that butter sells the best in them. They were about twice as long as the width, and larger at the top, so the butter can be turned out easily." The makers should let their light shine in the advertising columns of the WATCHMAN.

A "TERRIBLE STAR."—Speaking of a "new process" for making over-rotten butter, "as good as new," the *American Dairyman* says: "If all the poor, worthless store butter can be made over into a genuine 'gilt edge' article, it will be a terrible stab to the creamery interests of this country." We would like to have the *Dairyman* tell the world, if this renovation of stale grease is going to be so damaging to the creameries, what it thinks will be the result of all the work of our Dairywomen's Associations, experiment stations, conferences, and proposed dairy schools. Their evident purpose is, and their plain result (if successful) will be, to soon double or treble the output of butter in this country—not of revamped wheel-grease, but of high-grade dairy and creamery butter—and to do that with much fewer cows, with more cheaply-produced and better-economized feed, with a minute economy of labor, manure and all by-products, and consequently at a greatly reduced cost. If the one is a "stab," then is not the other likely to be wholesale destruction?

COMMON SENSE APPLIED TO FARMING.—We certainly would like to see a little more common sense displayed in treating of this and other economic subjects. We want to know if it is really believed by men calling themselves rational that the competition of utterly worthless goods, like "store butter" and oleo, is more dangerous to the dairy trade than competition with truly high-grade, honest goods. Our own notion is that the practical result of the efforts now being made to improve and perfect the dairy industries of America will be such an increase of production, such an improvement in quality and such a reduction of cost, that pure butter of superior flavor, good natural color and sound keeping quality, will be profitably sold at such low prices that abominations like "store butter" and oleo will as completely disappear as have homespun clothing and stage-coach traveling.

SELF-RESPECT.—The clap-trap appeals so constantly appearing in the press to prohibit this and put down that—this perpetual "scare politics" applied to agricultural questions—seems to us utterly unworthy of so great and powerful an industry as agriculture. The consuming public are not fools. As a class, they know good things when they see them, and want good things when they can get them. We have a right to demand a thorough inspection of all food products. We should court it for what we produce and demand it for what others produce. The fraudulently packed apples, the bogus "new sugar," the poor or watered milk, the ill-made butter and cheese, the bob veal, the measly pork—all call for the same inspection and the same public exposure and condemnation that we rightly demand for oleo. The honest farmer can stand it—nay, he can greatly profit by it. Honesty will prosper, but it will prosper most where dishonesty is rigidly exposed and punished. The farmers will put themselves at a great disadvantage with an intelligent public when they go so far as to claim immunity from the action of equal laws. They never have yet done so, and we do not believe they can be induced to do so.

THE TENDENCY OF THE TIMES is toward the cheapening of every thing consumed by mankind. The farmers can not escape this tendency. They demand cheapness in what they buy, and those who buy of them naturally make the same demand. It is inevitable. It behooves every man to understand this truth. Only by understanding it can we prosper. Unquestionably, if we are not growing our feed cheaply; if we do not keep good cows, or do not keep them rightly; if we do not know our trade thoroughly,—then what we produce is costing us too much. Our safety is in learning how to produce everything from the farm as cheaply as possible. We must not expect, either, that all we save by these methods we can always keep. Those who "catch on" early will make money; but in the long run the public will get the benefit of all improvements. Yet we have got to go on improving, or be crushed.

IT IS NOT AN EVIL that this is so. We do not complain because what we buy has been so greatly cheapened by improvements in mechanics in consequence of great inventions. It could not be expected that the progress of civilization should never reach the

farm and modify the methods of old times. In twenty-five years we have seen great changes in dairying. These changes will go on. We can not stop them, nor should we desire to do so. We old men, perhaps, will not change much; but be assured that, whether we do or not, the change will go on. The new farming is in sight.

### Notes By the Way.

Sows ought to be at least twelve months old before they are served, and then never by a boar younger than one year. One service is sufficient and it is unwise to allow more.

WHAT we need most is not larger farms, but larger farmers. Has any man a right to more land than he knows how to farm to profit? Has he a right to misuse and depreciate that by which the nation must live?

Is there anything better for the little people on a farm than to have the care of the little things? To have a pleasant work and business of their own, to go on regularly, as a part of the great comprehensive whole?

We are assured by a prominent agricultural authority (one of the candidates for the new secretaryship of agriculture) that "it has been proved that many cows will give more milk if sung to in a low key while being milked." Here is a cheap substitute for cotton-seed meal.

It is a mighty had plan to jump from one crop to another. This often has ruined many special-crop farmers. Keep steadily at the thing you can do best. If prices decline, try to make a bigger and better crop next year, when the prices will probably be up again, and you can get even.

"DON'T forget to pound up lots of bones for your hens; if there is any meat on them, so much the better," says an exchange. A farmer must have but little to do if he can afford to spend his time pounding up bones for his hens when he can buy bone-meal for less than two cents a pound. If you must pound them, at least have the sense to burn them first.

"As well might a lawyer hire some one to prepare and study and manage his law business, or a preacher employ another to fill his pulpit, as for a farmer to habitually buy such articles as corn, oats, bacon, lard, butter, beef, mules and horses, etc., the very things it is the peculiar business of the farmer to grow from his soil," says the *Southern Cultivator*. It is true that a farmer may specialize too much, either North or South, but it is better to do a few things well than more poorly.

### Hired Men.

The time for making contracts is approaching, and we feel moved to say a word or two about this matter. In the first place, it never pays to hire a "cheap" hand. A farmer may, possibly, sometimes get a good man to work for him at less wages than he is worth. The farmer will make a little unhalloved lucre by thus wronging him; but he will probably find a better place next year. The right, and in the long run the most profitable, way is to hire good men, pay them well, and keep them as long as you can. No matter how good a hand is, he can not do all that he might do for you until he gets acquainted with your land, your stock and your way of conducting the farm. A man who sweats, is dirty in person, or in his talk, or is a liar, no matter if he is a "tiger" to work, is not profitable to employ. There are good square men who are as good workers as any. Try to get such, and use them so they will want to stay with you. A correspondent of the *Homestead*, who signs his name, puts it strongly, from the hired man's point of view, as follows:

Who is to blame for the poor kind of help nowadays? I take care of a gentleman's place in the country, and he is one who knows how to use a man as he himself would like to be treated. We hear a great deal about the dignity of labor, though mostly by men who take hold of the light end of the log. Well, if labor is elevating, how is it that the hired man gets the poorest quarters to live in on the farm? I have worked on a farm where I could count the stars through the roof of my bedroom, and shovel the snow after each snow-fall out of the hole that served for a window. At another place I could have picked from my bed enough bedbugs to make a square meal for a dozen chickens, if I had stayed long enough to do so. No wonder the better class of help leave the farm to work in factories. They may not average as much wages in the long run as on a farm, but they can hire as good a room as they want and feel like men. Is there anything refining about working sixteen hours a day, eating your meals alone in the back kitchen, crawling up after the day's work is done into the attic by means of an old ladder, getting baked in summer and frozen in winter? If there is any I fail to see it. If a few of the hired men were to contribute their experiences to the *Homestead*, it would make mighty interesting reading.—W. B. Cunnison, Cordaville, Mass.

### Those Poor Cows.

Mr. Editor:—In your article on unprofitable cows you invite criticism from those of large experience. I make no claims to that, but, remembering that any fool can ask questions, I take the liberty to do it, and I do it with the better courage, you having an

## Advertisements.

### Rheumatism

It is an established fact that Hood's Sarsaparilla has proven an invaluable remedy in many severe cases of rheumatism, effecting remarkable cures by its powerful action in correcting the acidity of the blood, which is the cause of the disease, and purifying and enriching the vital fluid.

It is certainly fair to assume that what Hood's Sarsaparilla has done for others it will do for you. Therefore, if you suffer the pains and aches of rheumatism, give this potent remedy a fair trial.

#### A Positive Cure.

"I was troubled very much with rheumatism in my hips, ankles, and wrists. I could hardly walk, and was confined to my bed a good deal of the time. Being recommended to try Hood's Sarsaparilla, I took four bottles and am perfectly well. I cheerfully recommend Hood's Sarsaparilla as one of the best blood purifiers in the world." W. F. Wood, Bloomington, Ill.

#### For Twenty Years

I have been afflicted with rheumatism. Before 1883 I found no relief, but grew worse. I then began taking Hood's Sarsaparilla, and it did me more good than all the other medicine I ever had." H. T. Barlow, Shirley, Mass.

"I suffered from what the doctors called muscular rheumatism. I took Hood's Sarsaparilla and am entirely cured." J. V. A. Frothingham, letter carrier, Chicago, Ill.

We shall be glad to send, free of charge to all who may desire, a book containing many additional statements of cures by

### Hood's Sarsaparilla

Sold by all druggists. \$1; six for \$5. Made only by C. L. HOOD & CO., Lowell, Mass.

100 Doses One Dollar.

## Advertisements.

### Rheumatism,

BEING due to the presence of uric acid in the blood, is most effectively cured by the use of Ayer's Sarsaparilla. Be sure you get Ayer's and no other, and take it till the poisonous acid is thoroughly expelled from the system. We challenge attention to this testimony:—

"About two years ago, after suffering for nearly two years from rheumatic gout, being able to walk only with great discomfort, and having tried various remedies, including mineral waters, without relief, I saw by an advertisement in a Chicago paper that a man had been relieved of this distressing complaint, after long suffering, by taking Ayer's Sarsaparilla. I then decided to make a trial of this medicine, and took it regularly for eight months, and am pleased to state that it has effected a complete cure. I have since had no return of the disease."—Mrs. R. Irving Dodge, 110 West 125th St., New York.

"One year ago I was taken ill with inflammatory rheumatism, being confined to my house six months. I came out of the sickness very much debilitated, with no appetite, and my system disordered in every way. I commenced using Ayer's Sarsaparilla and began to improve at once, gaining in strength and soon recovering my usual health. I cannot say too much in praise of this well-known medicine."—Mrs. L. A. Stark, Nashua, N. H.

### Ayer's Sarsaparilla,

PREPARED BY  
Dr. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass.  
Price \$1; six bottles, \$5. Worth \$2 a bottle.

## PATRONS' PAINT WORKS

MANUFACTURERS OF

### Ingersoll's Liquid Rubber Paint.

Cheap and Indestructible Paints for Barns and Outbuildings.

Ten thousand Patrons of Husbandry and Farmers testify they are best and cheapest. Beautiful Sample Color Cards and Book of Instructions FREE. Write us and save money. We guarantee satisfaction.

### O. W. INCERSOLL,

Office 243 Plymouth St., - - - Brooklyn, New York.

## JOHNSON'S ANODYNE LINIMENT

Established 1810.

### — UNLIKE ANY OTHER. —

Positively Cures Diphtheria, Croup, Asthma, Bronchitis, Colds, Hoarseness, Hacking Cough, Whooping Cough, Catarrh, Influenza, Quins, Stomach, Diarrhoea, Rheumatism, Toothache, Earache, Nervous Headache, Sciatica, Lame Back, and Soreness in Body or Limbs.

### AS MUCH FOR INTERNAL AS FOR EXTERNAL USE.

It is marvelous how many different complaints it will cure. Its strong point lies in the fact that it acts quickly. Healing all Cuts, Burns and Bruises like Magic. Relieving all manner of Cramps, Chills, Lameness of Muscles or Stiff Joints and Strains.

#### ORIGINATED BY AN OLD FAMILY PHYSICIAN.

All who buy or order direct from us, and request, it shall receive a certificate that the money shall be refunded if not abundantly satisfied. Retail price 25 cts.; 6 bottles, \$2.00. Express prepaid to any part of the United States, or Canada. \$2.00. Valuable pamphlet sent free. J. S. JOHNSON & CO., Boston, Mass.

GENERATION AFTER GENERATION HAVE USED AND BLESSED IT.

## 80 ENTRIES.

The judge reported to the Vermont Dairywomen's Association on butter exhibited at the annual meeting, January 16-18, 1889, that it was the finest lot of butter he ever examined, of which there were eighty entries. Butter made by the

### Cooley Submerged Process

Was awarded the

### GRAND SWEEPSTAKES,

Dairy Sweepstakes,

### Three First Premiums

Out of a possible FIVE.

### COOLEY BUTTER

Also awarded the

Sweepstakes at Fat Stock Show, Chicago, November, 1888.

Send for ILLUSTRATED PRICE-LIST, free to all.

### VERMONT FARM MACHINE COMPANY,

BELLOWS FALLS, VT.

65,000

## Hanover Crackers Daily



Made at White River Junction, Vt. and Sold by all Dealers in Vt. and N. H. The steady increasing demand for my goods has compelled me each year to enlarge and increase my facilities, and now I have the largest and most complete factory of the kind in Vermont. Turning out over 65,000 HANOVER CRACKERS every working day proves that Hanover Crackers are what the people want.

#### ASK FOR SMITH'S CONFECTIONERY.

Thanking you for your generous patronage in the past and hoping you will always call for HANOVER CRACKERS and SMITH'S PURE CONFECTIONERY, I am respectfully,

George W. Smith, - - - White River Junction, Vt.

sawed questions of mine very satisfactorily in years past and invited me to come again. You quote Professor Collier as saying that if one half, or 770,000, of the poorest cows in the state of New York were killed, the profits of the dairy interest would be increased possibly ten-fold. Admitted. That is good protective tariff meat, such as the WATCHMAN readers are supposed to eat. Using Professor Collier's estimates these 770,000 cows would consume the products of 1,054,000 acres of meadow, and 2,032,800 acres of pasture, for which they would return \$18,885,000 worth of dairy goods after deducting \$1,155,000 for grain fed. To what other use could this land be put that would pay as well? Again, according to the text these same cows would pay \$2,117,500 in taxes. Will the present legislature pass a license law high enough to make up the deficiency; and if they do, will Governor Hill sign it? By the way, are cows taxed in New York per capita in New York? Is the dairy interest in New York burdened with a tax of over eight and one-half per cent on the average value of her cows? What fairness is there in averaging the interest and expenses of the cows and then classifying their returns? Why should a cow that would not sell for more than twenty dollars be charged the same for interest as the one hundred dollar cow? Why should the poorer dairies be charged the same for feed when it is a fact that they do not get near the same value? After charging the cows the average value of the hay on 1.37 acres of land, or \$22, why does he add \$1.52 for interest and replacement? Why does he not add eight and one-half per cent for taxes as he does on the cows, or is not real estate taxed in New York? Why kill the poor cow and then show in another column that much of the fault rests with the manufacturer of the products and the improper time when the cow is in profit? And, finally, what reason has he for making such claims as he does for the increase of profits from increased grain feed? It is a fact that those who feed grain largely are, as a rule, those who have the best cows, feed the most and best hay, care most for the comfort of their stock, have the best appliances for manufacturing their goods, and use the most skill in selling them; and what he credits to increased feed is, in my judgment, the result of most or all the things combined. The use he makes of his figures and the conclusions he arrives at reminds me of an old Washington county man who used to boast that "my son Joel" could cipher to the moon in sixteen minutes if let alone, and I should be tempted to think from his article on dairying that he was a descendant of "my son Joel," were it not that he, like many of the high-pedigreed and big-record cows, died and left us no seed.

### QUESTIONER.

#### The Dairy Industry.

Mr. Editor:—I find upon my return, after a short absence, your letter enclosing the criticisms of my anonymous correspondent upon certain of the conclusions which appeared to me clearly proven by the figures presented by Mr. C. J. Jennings in his "Cow Census" of Jefferson county in this state. This is a matter of so much vital importance to our agricultural industry that it should attract the attention of every intelligent farmer, and I hope that the result of this discussion will be the speedy adoption of better methods in our dairying, by which such a deplorable condition may be avoided. To appear even as attempting to depreciate the great dairy industry, as at present conducted, is so ungracious a task that I confess it would bring to me more of pleasure to find that your clever correspondent had upset my conclusions than of mortification at finding my figures erroneous. It must not be forgotten that these results we are discussing are those of one of the banner counties of this state, Jefferson standing twenty-sixth in a list of thirty-five of the dairy counties of New York as to the average value of products per cow, as shown by Dairy Commissioner Brown in his recent report. What, then, shall be said of the dry tree, if this is true of the green? Before proceeding to reply to the specific points made by your correspondent, let me present a few of the statistics which I take from the records of the Cow Census which Mr. Jennings has kindly furnished me for examination. I find the following: Forty-seven herds contained 643 cows. These herds had an aggregate of 1,550 acres of pasture and 979 acres of meadow. They also consumed 684 acres of fodder-corn, valued at \$1,335; also grain and bran (mainly grain) valued at \$1,402.30, and of hay bought and fed, \$230. The aggregate of taxes was \$1,637. The value of rough fodder consumed was \$1,306. The aggregate value of products \$14,382.71. We may consider this lot of cows by themselves, since they include entire dairy herds, and the cost of their keeping and value of their products is clearly shown. As I have already shown in a previous paper, the average acreage value of the hay crop in New York for twenty-five years has been \$16.05. It certainly can not but have averaged higher in so good a county as Jefferson, and the care and waste of feeding the hay must add somewhat to its value when sold in butter; but let us call the 979 acres of hay at \$16.05 and we have:

|                      |             |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Hay                  | \$15,712.95 |
| Grain                | 1,402.30    |
| Fodder corn          | 1,335.00    |
| Hay bought           | 230.00      |
| Rough fodder         | 1,306.00    |
| Taxes                | 1,637.00    |
| Total                | \$21,663.25 |
| Total production     | 14,382.71   |
| Loss                 | \$7,280.54  |
| Average loss per cow | \$11.33     |

It will be seen that in the above there is made no charge for the following items, each of which the reader may estimate for himself, but there is no doubt their aggregate will greatly increase the total loss on this lot of 643 cows, the entire number in forty-seven herds: (a) 1,550 acres of pasturing; (b) interest on cattle; (c) interest on land and buildings; (d) interest on dairy outfit; (e) repairs on buildings, fences, etc.; (f) manufacture of products; (g) marketing of products; (h) care of cattle, feeding, etc. The average value of the above forty-seven farms is \$34.69 per acre. It will be seen that in the above the criticisms of your correspondent are removed, since only those

items of expense are charged which are clearly established; but let us in like manner consider the entire record of the county, as presented in the "Cow Census," and the conclusion will, I think, be irresistible that, taken as a whole, the dairy industry, even in Jefferson county, is far from profitable:

|                          |              |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Number of herds          | 387          |
| Number of cows           | 5,567        |
| Total production         | \$714,000.50 |
| Average earnings per cow | \$127.44     |
| Acres in pasture         | 11,986       |
| Acres in meadow          | 6,613        |
| Acres in fodder corn     | 493          |

The value of feed, other than pasture or meadow, is shown by the following table:

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| Fodder corn                                       | \$4,048.90   |
| Hay   | 2,436.90     |
| Hay bought  | 1,546.00     |
| Rough fodder                                      | 1,269.50     |
| Malt sprouts                                      | 892.89       |
| Feedings  | 2,269.50     |
| Other feeds                                       | 127.89       |
| Total   | \$14,960.59  |
| Taxes   | 13,680.42    |
| Six thousand, six hundred fifteen acres in meadow | 106,178.75   |
| Total earnings                                    | \$154,960.13 |
| Total loss  | 124,960.99   |
| Difference  | \$30,000.97  |

It remains now to estimate the fair charge for the items already mentioned, including 11,900 acres of pasturing, which, even at \$2.60 per acre, would entirely absorb the difference between the total earnings and above cost, and there would remain absolutely nothing to meet the other seven items of necessary expense attending the industry, the aggregate of which, however estimated, would be the estimated loss to the industry in this county. Your correspondent certainly can hardly have any issue with one whom he says "admitted" to the statement that if the poorest one-half, or 770,000 cows, in our state, were killed, the profits to the dairy industry would be increased possibly ten-fold; but I confess that I can not fully understand why he asks to what other use the land could be put which supports these 770,000 cows "that would pay as well," when the very point is that at present it does not pay anything, since certainly he will not claim as a paying business the production of \$18,785,000 worth of dairy products, at a cost of, say thirty or forty millions of dollars. We laugh at the man who explained his ability to sell his goods at much below actual cost of production, on the ground that he did so large a business. Nor is it a sufficient answer to say that our dairymen know the conclusions of the writer and others are practically unsound, for that is the very point. Far too many of our dairymen do not know, and have not sufficiently considered, whether they are or have been conducting a really profitable business; or if, indeed, they have felt that no sufficient return was secured for their labor, they have been led to believe that other than the true causes brought this unhappy state of affairs about. I have already, perhaps, exceeded your limits of space, and have hardly taken up the several points of your correspondent, though perhaps some of them find answer in what I have written. I should be glad, at any future time, to return to his letter. PETER COLLIER, Geneva, New York.

EDITORIAL REMARKS.—There are no more important points concerning the profits of dairy farming than the ones here discussed between our intelligent Williamstown correspondent and the eminent agricultural chemist who is at the head of the Experiment Station of our great neighboring state. To get at the bottom facts, it is absolutely necessary that the farmer's view and the scientist's view of the subject should each be fully stated and mutually understood. This is preliminary to any definite practical conclusion. As we see it, there is no difference between them as to the woeful losses occurring to our great industry in consequence of an imperfect knowledge of the business points connected with its management. Farmers are not accustomed to figure out their transactions closely, as do merchants and manufacturers. When they attempt it, they find what many of them consider insurmountable difficulties in the way, but they ought to be willing to accept help from men trained to accurate thinking and mathematical statements. These may not be always right, and that farmers should attempt to traverse them is encouraging. It would be much worse if they should be so indifferent as not to notice them at all.

#### Warming the Water.

Mr. Editor:—You ask the farmers to give you their experience in warming water for stock and their views thereon. Mine are as follows: I have a stock of seventeen head of cattle, and have a water-tub that holds sixty pails of water. The first of December I put in one of Kiser's water-heaters, manufactured by J. T. Drew of Cabot, this, with a fair stream running into the tub, will heat the water to seventy degrees (which I consider about the right heat) in fifty minutes, at an expense of about one cent. This will keep it warm while the stock are all drinking. They will not generally drink more than once a day. Ten cows average to take five hundred pounds of water per day. They drink it readily and appear to enjoy it much better than before I began to warm it. Those that have just calved will drink twice a day and take about thirty-five pounds of water at a time. This is, of course, a question upon which there are various opinions. Some of the best dairymen say they would not have the water warmed for their stock at all, while others are strongly in favor of it. For myself, I am fully convinced that my stock does better. I can keep them at less expense and make more butter than when I used cold water, and I think that the water-heater is a good investment for any farmer. I hope that farmers will give us their experience freely through the columns of your paper. J. M. FISHER, Cabot, February 18, 1889.

DR. HOSKINS will be glad to send a copy of his Seed and Nursery Catalogue free to any address sent him by postal, or otherwise. Address T. H. Hoskins, Newport, Vt.